

REMARKS

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 30-31, 33-38, 42-43, 45-46, 48-50, 54-55, and 57-58 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over “UPnP AV Architecture: 0.83” to Ritchie et al. (“*Ritchie*”) in view of “ContentDirectory: 1 Service Template Version 1.01” to Debique et al. (“*Debique*”), and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,473,903 B2 to Balakrishnan et al. (“*Balakrishnan*”); rejected claims 32, 39, 41, 44, 47, 53, and 56 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Ritchie*, *Debique*, *Balakrishnan*, and further in view of “Playing Audio on Your PPC From Your Desktop” to Conger et al. (“*Conger*”); rejected claims 40 and 52 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Ritchie*, *Debique*, *Balakrishnan*, and further in view of “Hypertext Transfer Protocol -- HTTP/1.1” to Fielding et al. (“*Fielding*”); rejected claims 30-31, 33-38, 42-43, 45-46, 48-50, 54-55, and 57-58 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Ritchie* in view of *Debique*, and further in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0129374 A1 to Freeman et al. (“*Freeman*”); rejected claims 32, 39, 41, 44, 47, 53, and 56 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Ritchie*, *Debique*, *Freeman*, and further in view of *Conger*, and rejected claims 40 and 52 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Ritchie*, *Debique*, *Freeman*, and further in view of *Fielding*.

By the present amendment, Applicant has amended claims 30, 38, 42, 45, 54, 57, and 58. Claims 30-58 remain pending.

Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection of claims 30-31, 33-38, 42-43, 45-46, 48-50, 54-55, and 57-58 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Ritchie* in view of *Debique*, and further in view of *Balakrishnan*.

Independent claim 30 recites a content providing server including, for example, a content distribution control section “wherein the content distribution control section streams the content, corresponding to the channels, the content being simultaneously streamed over a single connection as a single unit of controlled content, the single unit of streamed content being represented by a single URL (Uniform Resource Locator), and being streamed on the basis of a control request corresponding to a second channel list received from the client.” *Ritchie*, *Debique*, and *Balakrishnan* do not disclose the claimed “content distribution control section.”

The Office Action states: “Examiner agrees that neither *Ritchie* nor *Debique* explicitly discloses the content being simultaneously streamed over a single connection as a single unit of controlled content.” (Page 3).

*Balakrishnan* discloses:

multiple main programs are multiplexed together and broadcast as a multiplexed data stream over a single broadcast channel, along with the multiplexed stream of packets of compressed multimedia content corresponding to the different commercials, and the packets of multimedia content that together comprise the video segment that displays the menu of multimedia hotspots . . . each commercial packet is preferably provided with a respective Packet Identification (PID) Code or other suitable identification code to enable the commercial packets corresponding to the commercial selected for viewing to be identified and separated from the multiplexed data stream, and then re-assembled. (Column 4, lines 11-44).

Thus, *Balakrishnan* discloses broadcasting a multiplexed stream of packets, where each packet has a unique Packet Identification Code. *Balakrishnan*, however, does not disclose a content distribution control section wherein a single unit of streamed content is being represented by a single URL (Uniform Resource Locator) as recited in

claim 30. This is because *Balakrishnan* discloses broadcasting a stream of packets where each packet is assigned a Packet Identification Code and does not disclose streaming “single unit of streamed content being represented by a single URL,” as recited in claim 30.

Further, even if *Ritchie*, *Debique*, and *Balakrishnan* were combined, the combination would not disclose a content distribution control section wherein a “single unit of streamed content [is] being represented by a single URL (Uniform Resource Locator),” as recited in claim 30. Instead, *Debique* discloses a URI to locate a single object added to a playlistContainer where a unique object id is assigned to each object enumerated in the playlistContainer to individually play each data object on various rendering devices in a particular order. See *Debique* page 87, Section 7.1.

Neither *Ritchie* nor *Debique* disclose streaming the “single unit of streamed content,” and thus, cannot disclose the “single URL (Uniform Resource Locator)” representing the “single unit of streamed content,” as recited in claim 30. Moreover, *Balakrishnan* does not disclose the claimed “single URL (Uniform Resource Locator)” representing the “single unit of streamed content,” as recited in claim 30. Therefore, any combined system of *Ritchie*, *Debique*, and *Balakrishnan* would not disclose the claimed content distribution control section “wherein the content distribution control section streams the content, corresponding to the channels, the content being simultaneously streamed over a single connection as a single unit of controlled content, the single unit of streamed content being represented by a single URL (Uniform Resource Locator), and being streamed on the basis of a control request corresponding to a second channel list received from the client,” as recited in claim 30.

Accordingly, *Ritchie*, *Debique*, and *Balakrishnan*, whether taken alone or in combination, fail to disclose the subject matter of claim 30.

Independent claims 42, 45, 54, and 57-58, while of different scope than claim 30, distinguish over *Ritchie*, *Debique*, and *Balakrishnan* for at least the same reasons as claim 30.

Claims 31, 33-38, 43, 46, 48-50, and 55, depend from one of claims 30, 42, 45, and 54. Accordingly, *Ritchie*, *Debique*, and *Balakrishnan* fail to disclose the subject matter of claims 31, 33-38, 43, 46, 48-50, and 55.

Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection of claims 32, 39, 41, 44, 47, 53, and 56 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Ritchie*, *Debique*, *Balakrishnan*, and further in view of *Conger* and the rejection of claims 40 and 52 as being unpatentable over *Ritchie*, *Debique*, *Balakrishnan*, and further in view of *Fielding*.

Claims 32, 39, 40, 41, 44, 47, 52, 53, and 56 depend from one of the independent claims 30, 42, 45, and 54. *Conger* and *Fielding*, taken individually or in combination, fail to cure the deficiencies of *Ritchie*, *Debique*, *Balakrishnan*.

*Conger* and *Fielding* fail to teach or suggest, the claimed content distribution control section “wherein the content distribution control section streams the content, corresponding to the channels, the content being simultaneously streamed over a single connection as a single unit of controlled content, the single unit of streamed content being represented by a single URL (Uniform Resource Locator), and being streamed on the basis of a control request corresponding to a second channel list received from the client,” as recited in claim 30 and similar recitations in claims 42, 45, and 54.

Accordingly, *Ritchie*, *Debique*, *Balakrishnan*, *Conger*, and/or *Fielding* fail to disclose the subject matter of claims 32, 39, 40, 41, 44, 47, 52, 53, and 56.

Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection of claims 30-31, 33-38, 42-43, 45-46, 48-50, 54-55, and 57-58 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Ritchie* in view of *Debique*, and further in view of *Freeman*.

Independent claim 30 recites a content providing server comprising, among other things a content distribution control section “wherein the content distribution control section streams the content, corresponding to the channels, the content being simultaneously streamed over a single connection as a single unit of controlled content, the single unit of streamed content being represented by a single URL (Uniform Resource Locator), and being streamed on the basis of a control request corresponding to a second channel list received from the client.” *Ritchie*, *Debique*, and *Freeman* do not disclose the claimed “content distribution control section.”

The Office Action states: “the combination of *Ritchie* and *Debique* does not explicitly disclose that the content being simultaneously streamed over a single connection as a single unit of controlled content.” (Page 21).

*Freeman* discloses:

[a]n multiplexer combines the various digital signals into a reduced number of transmission data streams for transmission. The various NTSC television channels may be allocated in a predetermined fashion to maximize the number of simultaneously transmittable signals. The multiplexer in conjunction with the television transmission system multiplexes the desired data streams onto the desired channels, and transmits these signals over the NTSC channels. The number of video signals which may be multiplexed onto a data stream on a single transmission channel will vary depending on the video signals to be transmitted. (Paragraph [0014]).

Thus, *Freeman* discloses combining various digital signals into transmission data streams, which are then transmitted over NTSC channels. *Freeman*, however, does not disclose a content distribution control section wherein a single unit of streamed content is being represented by a single URL (Uniform Resource Locator). This is because *Freeman* discloses transmitting data streams over NTSC channels and does not disclose streaming “single unit of streamed content being represented by a single URL,” as recited in claim 30.

Further, even if *Ritchie*, *Debique*, and *Freeman* were combined, the combination would not disclose a content distribution control section wherein a single unit of streamed content is being represented by a single URL (Uniform Resource Locator), because neither *Ritchie* nor *Debique* disclose streaming the “single unit of streamed content,” and thus, cannot disclose the “single URL (Uniform Resource Locator)” representing the “single unit of streamed content,” as recited in claim 30.

Moreover, *Freeman* does not disclose the claimed “single URL (Uniform Resource Locator)” representing the “single unit of streamed content,” as recited in claim 30. Therefore, the combined system of *Ritchie*, *Debique*, and *Freeman* does not disclose the claimed content distribution control section “wherein the content distribution control section streams the content, corresponding to the channels, the content being simultaneously streamed over a single connection as a single unit of controlled content, the single unit of streamed content being represented by a single URL (Uniform Resource Locator), and being streamed on the basis of a control request corresponding to a second channel list received from the client,” as recited in claim 30.

Accordingly, *Ritchie*, *Debique*, and *Freeman* whether taken alone or in combination, fail to disclose the subject matter of claim 30.

Independent claims 42, 45, 54, and 57-58, while of different scope than claim 30, distinguish over *Ritchie*, *Debique*, and *Freeman* for at least the same reasons as claim 30.

Claims 31, 33-38, 43, 46, 48-50, and 55, depend from one of claims 30, 42, 45, and 54. Accordingly, *Ritchie*, *Debique*, and *Freeman* fail to disclose the subject matter of claims 31, 33-38, 43, 46, 48-50, and 55.

Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) of claims 32, 39, 41, 44, 47, 53, and 56 as being unpatentable over *Ritchie*, *Debique*, *Freeman*, and further in view of *Conger* and the rejection of claims 40 and 52 as being unpatentable over *Ritchie*, *Debique*, *Freeman*, and further in view of *Fielding*.

Claims 32, 39, 40, 41, 44, 47, 52, 53, and 56 depend from one of the independent claims 30, 42, 45, and 54. *Conger* and *Fielding*, taken individually or in combination, fail to cure the deficiencies of *Ritchie*, *Debique*, *Freeman*.

*Conger* and *Fielding* fail to teach or suggest, the claimed content distribution control section “wherein the content distribution control section streams the content, corresponding to the channels, the content being simultaneously streamed over a single connection as a single unit of controlled content, the single unit of streamed content being represented by a single URL (Uniform Resource Locator), and being streamed on the basis of a control request corresponding to a second channel list received from the client,” as recited in claim 30.

Accordingly, *Ritchie, Debique, Freeman, Conger, and/or Fielding* fail to disclose the subject matter of claims 32, 39, 40, 41, 44, 47, 52, 53, and 56.

In view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of this application and the timely allowance of the pending claims.

Please grant any extensions of time required to enter this response and charge any additional required fees to our deposit account 06-0916.

Respectfully submitted,

FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW,  
GARRETT & DUNNER, L.L.P.

Dated: September 16, 2008

By: \_\_\_\_\_

  
Michael Kelly  
Reg. No. 33,921